DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 449 CS 000 432

AUTHOR	Berg, Paul C., Ed.; George, John E., Ed.
TITLE	Current Administrative Problems in Reading. Highlights of the 1967 Pre-Convention Institutes.
INSTITUTION	International Reading Association, Newark, Del.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	43p.
AVAILABLE FROM	International Reading Association, 6 Tyre Avenue, Newark, Del. 19711 ($1.75 non-member, $1.50 member)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Administration; *Educational Innovation; Educational Research; Evaluation Needs; Government Role; *Inservice Education; Instructional Materials Centers; *Reading Programs; *Reading Research; School Industry Relationship

ABSTRACT

Five papers concerning administrative problems in reading discuss administrative innovation, reading research, inservice education, and program funding. Forces promoting innovation include the federal government, industry, and educational research, the force which is seen as the basis for progress in education. Learning resource centers, administrative recognition of teaching success, and in-class research are among the eight recommendations included for inservice education. Team enrollment, for both first-grade teachers and school principals, in college reading courses is also emphasized as a means of providing inservice opportunities to develop and implement improved reading programs. ESEA/Title I, III, and IV and NDEA/Title XI grants are noted as major sources of program funding, and current programs are described. (This document previously announced as ED 027 159.) (RT)

ED 073449

HIGHLIGHTS
OF THE
1967 PRE-CONVENTION INSTITUTES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Paul C. Berg
and
John E. George
Editors

CURRENT ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS IN READING

Thorsten R. Carlson
Chairman of the Institute

INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION

Newark, Delaware

CS 000432

INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS

1967-1968

President: H. Alan Robinson, Hofstra University, Old Westbury, New York
President-elect: Leo Fay, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
Past President: Mildred A. Dawson, Sacramento State College, California

* * *

Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Ralph C. Staiger, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware

Assistant Executive Secretary: Ronald W. Mitchell, International Reading Association, Newark, Delaware

* * *

DIRECTORS

Term expiring June 1968

Althea Beery, Cincinnati Public Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio
Brother Leonard Courtney, FSC, The Christian Brothers, St. Paul, Minnesota
Grace McClellan, Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg, Manitoba

Term expiring June 1969

Margaret J. Early, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York
Theodore Harris, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington
Eve Malmquist, National School for Educational Research, Linkoping, Sweden

Term expiring June 1970

Millard H. Black, Los Angeles City School Districts, California
Amelia Melnik, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona
Virginia D. Yates, Prairie District Schools, Prairie Village, Kansas

* * *

Publications Coordinator: Faye R. Branca, International Reading Association, Newark, Delaware

* * *

Copyright 1968 by the
International Reading Association, Inc.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
International Reading Association
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

FOREWORD

The Twelfth Annual Convention of the International Reading Association met in Seattle, Washington, May 2-6, 1967. The first two days were devoted to a series of institutes dealing with specific areas in the field of reading.

The following Institutes were held:

I. Bold Action Programs for the Disadvantaged: Elementary Reading
Chairman: Gertrude Whipple
Detroit Public Schools

II. Current Administrative Problems in Reading
Chairman: Thorsten R. Carlson
Sonoma Park College

III. Reading and Concept Attainment
Chairman: Russell G. Stauffer
University of Delaware

IV. Junior College Reading Programs
Chairman: Horst G. Taschow
Central Oregon College

V. Interdisciplinary Approach to Reading Disabilities
Chairman: Gilbert Schiffman
Maryland Public Schools

VI. In-Service Programs in Reading
Chairman: Dwane Russell
East Texas Center for Educational Services

The sessions represented by these papers attempted to examine in depth the thought and practice that currently prevails in these specialized areas. It is hoped that the reader will gain at least in small measure some of the inspiration and motivation that were produced by the sessions themselves.

Paul Conrad Berg
General Chairman

The International Reading Association attempts, through its publications, to provide a forum for a wide spectrum of opinion on reading. This policy permits divergent viewpoints without assuming the endorsement of the Association.

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Foreword Paul Conrad Berg University of South Carolina	iii
Forces Leading Toward Administrative Change Paul J. Avery Winnetka, Illinois, Public Schools	1
A Research Approach to Reading Problems Bjorn Karlsen Sonoma State College	10
What is Needed in In-service Education? Harry T. Hahn Oakland University	16
In-service Training for the Administrator and the Reading Teacher Walter J. McHugh California State College at Hayward	23
Funding the Program Doris Gunderson U.S. Office of Education	33

FORCES LEADING TOWARD ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE

Paul J. Avery

Winnetka, Illinois, Public Schools

THIS IS A STORMY DECADE for American schools and the men and women who represent them, for they have been gloriously or ingloriously, according to one's view, catapulted out of cozy backwaters and thrust precipitously into the rough and tumble, no-hold-barred world of social ferment.

School personnel have ridden and subdued the tiger of educational reform movements periodically. But the educational reformers of this decade are trained revolutionaries, and they represent three converging revolutions--the cultural, the scientific, and the educational. They are dedicated to the belief that education is the key to man's survival on this planet and to the proposition that this nation is capable of developing a system of educational excellence which will sustain and enrich all of the people. In their aid, they have enlisted the influence and resources of the federal government, the influence and knowledge of American industry, the keen commitment of the most astute researchers and scholars, and the tentative support, at least, of the man-in-the-street. Gone are those cozy backwaters where there was

> time yet for a hundred indecisions,
> and for a hundred visions and revisions,
> before the taking of toast and tea.

Education by Grapevine

The frustrating side of the new revolution is that the American public schools were never programed for across-the-board change, being a network of several thousand, semiautonomous districts linked by a grapevine of professional associations, college campuses, educational journals, visitations, and NDEA Institutes.

Education by grapevine can be a slow and tortuous route, but the character and content of American education have been shaped by message units passing along that grapevine. Some messages take 25 to 50 years to travel from source to destination and are pretty garbled when they arrive. It may be that the grapevine system of education is appropriate no longer to a computerized society--but, just how does one rewire a grapevine?

Schools, A Reflection of Society

It has been said that the public schools are a reflection of society, and if true, society has a badly blurred image. Some schools still reflect the society of the high-buttoned shoes--a society that paid no tribute to educational excellence and whose patrons asserted proudly that there was absolutely nothing wrong with the schools: "After all, I graduated, didn't I?" That society was left behind at the cracking of the sound barrier, but its legacy is still entrenched in the American mind.

A few reflect a conceptual image of education in the 21st century. Consider the schools without classrooms, where color-coded children roam about looking for the right color-coded teacher to plug them into a headset.

The vast majority of educators are in a state of transition, which is "in" language for confusion. In the board room, the classroom, and the faculty lounge, one engages in profound argument over status quo methods and procedures versus bold new approaches to the teaching and learning process. The demands for innovation have placed new stresses on working relationships which show up in symptoms of tension, defensiveness, and divergence from the main task. The most pressing need is to develop an orderly administrative process for the definition of priority objectives and to direct efforts and resources toward the attainment of these objectives quickly and effectively. Until this goal can be accomplished, there exists an embarrassing vulnerability to the pressures for change.

The Knowledge Explosion

What then are the forces capable of generating administrative change in the coming decade? And specifically, at what targets are they aimed? Although the forces come in many guises, there is essentially one target: to raise the level of man's literacy in an increasingly unintelligible world.

The knowledge explosion and the liberation of man from absolute dependence upon his environment and his ignorance took a giant step five centuries ago when the first Gutenberg Bible rolled off the press. Suddenly, the ability to read was no longer a mysterious symbol of knowledge to be learned solely as an exercise in erudition. Men of perception and ambition discovered that reading was the lever with which they could reshape their world. Five centuries later the ability to read, critically and purposefully, became a basic requirement for the performance of the most minimum of functions in modern society.

Yet today, there are eleven million citizens in the United states age 18 and over, who cannot read or write. There are many more millions whose deficiencies in reading prevent them from achieving full productivity.

Public schools are still producing a disproportionate number of nonreaders, problem readers, retarded readers, marginal readers, and indifferent readers. Until the system has developed, and can sustain, across-the-board reading programs geared for the 10 percent of children who require specialized assistance and reinforcement and the 90 percent of children who require a flexible developmental reading program which supports them in their subject-matter fields, the teaching of reading will continue to be dynamically affected by the forces which are generating change inside the schools. Francis Keppel, former U.S. commissioner of education, expressed this thought very succinctly when he stated, "every examination of the problem of our schools of poverty, every question raised by troubled parents about our schools, every learning disorder seem to show some association with reading disability."

Emergence of Federal Government

The most immediate force leading to administrative change in the public schools has been the emergence of the federal government in the field of public and private education. The government is bringing to bear the five ingredients which are necessary to produce change: a plan of action, money, authority, manpower, and pressure.

Over one billion dollars was made available in 1966 for Title One projects alone, and it has been estimated that 80 percent of these projects were concerned with reading and related activities. Most of the early Title One programs have been crash programs: some hastily conceived, and many defying evaluation; but all born with the good intention of proving that even the severest of reading disabilities is not insoluble given enough specialists, materials, equipment, and teacher aides.

Project Head Start

Project Head Start has been referred to by some as the nation's biggest peacetime mobilization in human resources. Already, nearly a million and a half children in 2,400 communities have completed a Head Start Program. Head Start was fast on the track and has undeniably demonstrated that the federal government can mobilize its resources--quickly and effectively. How fast would Project Head Start have spread to 2,400 communities along the grapevine system of education? How many local school boards and local administrators would have even dared to begin such an undertaking?

How many, today, are gearing themselves toward the reduction of class size, the employment of paraprofessionals and the utilization of diagnostic teams in the primary grades to resolve once and for all whether the spectacular gains attributed to Head Start children can be sustained by the public schools?

Research on Education

A second force destined to generate change during the next decade is the gradual transition of the public schools from an intuition-oriented institution to a research-oriented institution. Massive research in other fields of human endeavor--medicine, agriculture, and industrial technology--have produced awe-inspiring results. The sector of private industry expends a minimum of 10 percent of its total budget for research activity. Money expended on educational research this year amounts to about one half of one percent of the education budget--and this is a significant gain over the past. Seed money for educational research is now readily available from private foundations and governmental agencies, and new technological systems are under development for the storage, retrieval, analysis, and general dissemination of research data.

One branch of research which surely will result in major changes in reading instruction practices is that sector which is concerned with language disorders. Estimates of the number of children whose school performance is retarded by language disorders extend from 7 percent to 20 percent of the total elementary school population, and intensive clinical research with these children is providing fantastic new insights on how children learn to read.

If public schools are relatively unmoved by publications on educational research and theory, they should at least begin to take note of the impact of this matter upon the reading public. Probably Jerome Bruner's essay on the "Process of Education" has been more widely read and discussed among noneducators than among educators, and the respective contributions of Kephart, Delacato, Frostig, deHirsh, Montessori, Sullivan, and Bloom are widely circulated among the literate public. School administrators and teachers cannot afford to be less informed than parents about theories of reading and reading disabilities. Nor can they drag their feet when it comes to injecting the results of significant research efforts into the school program.

The Transisterized Generation

A third force which will generate change in the public schools results from the application of modern technology to

the educational process. A child today packing necessities for a camping expedition includes, perhaps, a transistorized television set, tape recorder, tiny wrist radio, portable record player, and a walkie-talkie set. For in the transistorized generation personal possessions include more instructional equipment than there exists per classroom in well-equipped elementary schools. It is a strange and, hopefully temporary phenomenon that whereas one has constructed homes, offices, and factories so as to enjoy and profit from modern labor-saving equipment, the only standard piece of equipment that one can be sure to find in every classroom is the pencil sharpener.

The growing involvement of big business in the production and sale of educational goods and services has taken on immense proportions since the recent mergers between the makers of software (the textbook publishers) and the makers of hardware (manufacturers of machines, instruments, and devices). There is tangible evidence that the corporations are prepared to invest heavily, both in time and money, in the development of materials and programs which will assist teachers to identify and to provide for individual differences in reading progression.

The Potential of Industry

Individualized instruction in reading, in its fullest sense, has been an unattainable goal in most school systems. This condition does not result from lack of interest or skill on the part of the instructional staff but arises from the sheer numbers and diversity of pupils, the transience of personnel, and the inadequacy of materials to sustain and supplement an individualized program.

In modern technology, there exists the capability to develop comprehensive, definitive, and stimulating systems of individualized instruction, keyed to in-class instruction or independent study under a continuous learning sequence.

Although industry possesses the resources to develop such a system, it cannot be done without the cooperation, participation, and responsible evaluation of the schools in the developmental stages.

Educators in the Winnetka Schools are deeply involved with the application of modern technology to the teaching process. Having become increasingly concerned with their capabilities as a school system to implement a philosophy of individualized instruction, they approached the research department of the Borg-Warner Corp. with the problem. Space in the Hubbard Woods School was set aside and equipped as a research and testing laboratory. Borg-Warner technicians,

engineers, and researchers formed a work team with teachers and content area specialists. Educators prepared the specifications and Borg-Warner engineered programs and constructed automated equipment for teaching the programs. Concentration was on three subject areas: reading, mathematics, and French. Programs have been designed to supplement and enrich teacher instruction, to reinforce teacher instruction, and to relieve the teacher of whole segments of instruction. Each program was tested and retested on children, first under rigid laboratory conditions and then in a classroom setting.

After three years of experimental work, fears about programed learning and teaching machines are disappearing. The programs and equipment are moving out of the laboratory and into classrooms or learning resource centers at the request of teachers who have familiarized themselves with their usage.

A beginning has been made with this first instance where industry has utilized its resources to come to the aid of one school system. (Robert Ingersoll, chairman of the board of the Borg-Warner Corporation, is a past president of the Winnetka Board of Education and is personally committed to the philosophy of the schools.)

The most ambitious experiment of all is Project Plan developed by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation and the American Institutes for Research in the Behaviorial Sciences, an experiment which will connect all participating schools to computer headquarters via individualized terminals. The computer will select instructional methods, make assignments, and evaluate the students' performance and progress. Modern technology has made it clear to many that the grapevine system of education is no longer appropriate to a computerized society--and the grapevine is being rewired right under one's very eyes.

The Role of the Administrator

How does the school administrator perceive his role in handling the forces which have been described? Will he serve as a catalyst for change or as the caretaker of tradition? Will he stand in the ranks who jeer or with those who cheer at the new technology?

There is a warning in the air that "the dogmas of our quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present." The administrator will become increasingly burdened with demands for reforms, both from within his faculty and outside his faculty. He will face decision-making tasks which are beyond the ken of his present training and experience. Change today is inescapable. The school administrator who perceives his role as a choice among ignoring the forces of change, resisting them blindly, or embracing them indiscriminately will not

survive the next decade.

The administrator-in-demand will be the one who establishes by word and action that he is primarily a leader of instruction; who is trained to distinguish between less-effective instructional practices and more-effective instructional practices; who can get promising programs started, expanded, or stopped on the basis of nonsubjective data; who has the fortitude to deal with unreasonable resistance to change; who can open up undiscussable issues and engage in exploratory thinking in public; who can challenge his staff to greater efforts without demoralizing them; and who places educational planning above the trivia of administration.

The administrator-in-demand believes that a comprehensive, yet flexible, reading program which cuts across subject-matter boundaries is fundamental to providing the best possible education for children. He says it! He means it! He implements it!

Today's administrator-in-demand is already setting the pace for the coming decade as he involves himself in the planning or the implementation of one or more of the following programs:

1. Forming a standing reading improvement committee. This is a committee assigned to appraise the existing reading program, to identify priority needs, and to define developmental objectives for each level of instruction. The committee has sufficient funds so that it may accumulate a resource library of reading programs and materials, visit schools which are engaging in experimental programs, and invite competent reading specialists to meet in an advisory capacity.

2. Improving beginning reading instruction. The administrator-in-demand realizes that concentrating full and effective support behind the pre-primary and primary teachers will produce immediate results toward the prevention of reading failures. This goal can be realistically accomplished by reducing class size, employing teacher assistants, making available a wealth of instructional materials, and utilizing specialists for the early diagnosis of children with learning disorders. Money expended in support at this level will cut down on demands for expensive remedial and clinical programs at later levels of instruction.

3. Developing a continuous in-service program. School systems which sincerely desire to improve reading instruction must design in-service programs to help classroom teachers become better reading teachers. They can start with study groups for teachers and administrators to keep abreast of the growing research and literature on reading instruction. More staff members should be sent to reading conventions and

institutes and be expected to report their findings in detail to the entire faculty. A model in-service program will include workshops where teachers can gain first-hand knowledge about different approaches to reading instruction, how to provide for individual differences, how to evaluate and diagnose reading problems, and how to utilize the new media of instruction.

4. Utilizing paraprofessionals in the reading program. Parents, older students, and adult volunteers can be utilized to supervise planned enrichment activities which reinforce the classroom reading program. Paraprofessionals must thoroughly understand the limitations of their assignment and should undergo a training program designed to teach them how to work with classroom teachers and pupils. Increased motivation and improvement of skills are the most significant contributions which can result from paraprofessional and volunteer programs.

5. Establishing learning resource centers. Learning resource centers are becoming the focal point for instructional activities in more and more schools. The center provides the child with a place to learn in a more informal environment than the classroom. He may engage in independent study or gather in small interchangeable groups for self-selected learning activities supported by a variety of instructional materials and equipment.

6. Using the summer school program. The summer school program can provide an ideal setting for a school laboratory. Teachers will more readily accept this opportunity to test out new methods of reading instruction and experiment with different kinds of groups. Children will enjoy a refreshing change from regular assignments. The summer school can become an exciting intellectual adventure for teachers and pupils free from the stigma of duplicating the regular school year.

Conclusion

The future of the public schools will be as precarious and unpredictable as has been their past. Presumably, every generation of school administrator has believed that his era was the worst and the best. Educators today are experiencing a long-overdue renaissance of interest in education. The energies which have been unleashed to improve public education provide an occasion for rejoicing among school people who have worked and prayed for a larger share of the financial and intellectual resources of this nation. One cannot be mesmerized by quick and easy solutions, but far less can one forfeit the opportunity to apply intelligence, enthusiasm, and creativity to the job ahead. Those who are concerned

with the new directions in education are begging for leadership and for a breed of school administrators who are prepared to risk failure in order to discover better ways of teaching children.

A RESEARCH APPROACH TO READING PROBLEMS

Bjorn Karlsen

Sonoma State College

ONE OF THE THINGS one expects to get out of a national convention is a look at the new material coming out in a given field. The 1967 national IRA convention is probably exhibiting more reading materials, equipment, and gadgets than have ever before been exhibited all at one time. The people who are in charge of obtaining instructional materials for their schools are typically overwhelmed by the deluge of material publishers and manufacturers claim can teach all kinds of skills to all sorts of children. Since many items are designed for similar purposes, the task of the person purchasing the materials is one of choosing and deciding what is most suitable for the particular purposes of a given school district.

Because of the recent influx of funds into education, which can be used for the purchase of instructional materials, one finds that the producers of educational materials are having sales of unprecedented magnitude. One publisher states sales in his department are up fifty percent over last year's, a situation which is probably not at all uncommon. It appears, however, that after the first binge on federal money, many school administrators are sitting back asking themselves if this material or equipment really does what the producer claims that it does. Are there valid reasons for using it? This question introduces the field of materials evaluation.

There are many ways in which materials can be evaluated, one of the most important of which is a form of curricular validation where the curriculum specialist goes through the material carefully to make some sort of an evaluation, some type of prediction, as to its usefulness with children for whom it is intended. This paper, however, concerns only one phase of this; namely, the research aspect of reading: how we study reading instruction, reading materials, gadgets, children in the reading program, etc. Of particular concern are the problems facing the school administrator today--how to teach reading and with what kinds of approaches and materials--and the problems which the researcher faces in working with or within the setting of the public schools.

Who Should Experiment?

When someone gets a new idea or develops a new set of materials for reading instruction, whose responsibility is it to

experiment with this material? During the 1966 annual convention of IRA a "Buyer Be Wary" policy was adopted: "Distributors of reading devices or materials have an ethical obligation to submit their products to fair scientific trials before marketing and to make data of these evaluations available to all prospective purchasers." It would appear, then, that the point of view of IRA is that the publisher himself must submit his material to scientific experimentation. It is doubtful that more than one percent of the materials currently being sold have been submitted to "fair scientific trials" by an independent and disinterested party. The point of view of many publishers is that they have put out the best material they know how to put out and they think it only fair that the public school try it out.

Should educators submit children to experimentation with new instructional materials when there is little assurance from the publisher that children will learn what they ought to learn from it? One of the very fundamental principles of child development is that behavior is irreversible. When a child has been put through the first grade with a certain set of reading materials, he cannot go back. The child is now a year older, he is going into the second grade, and if the novel approach failed, he is in trouble. So the schools, fearing undesirable effects upon the children, have been reluctant to try radical departures from proven instructional materials.

Some time ago this writer received a letter from a person who had invented a new way of teaching reading by means of a new kind of alphabet. He wanted endorsement, telling people in the public schools that this system was something schools ought to experiment with. He felt this was a fair request. He had produced this material and thought it should be up to the schools to try it out. In my reply, I pointed out to him that testing the material was indeed his responsibility, that he needed to try the material with a few youngsters in a carefully controlled situation and not put it out on the market for general consumption before such a trial had been made. By return mail I received a rather irate letter saying that if I would not endorse his request to the public schools, how could one possibly get innovation into the field of education. I, in return, informed him that in my opinion his system was inconsistent with what I think is known about how children learn and how reading can be taught and that I would, therefore, be cautious about proceeding with this new approach until a very small and carefully controlled study had been done. Such a study should experiment with a group of children whose parents were aware of the fact that their children were being experimented on with a radically different and yet unproven system of teaching reading.

Educators do have a responsibility to develop new and better ways of teaching children. Schools which were good enough for one's parents are not going to be good enough for today's children, but one must proceed in a responsible way. The best resolution is through cooperative ventures between publishers and school systems toward the development of newer and better ways of teaching reading.

How Should One Experiment?

Most of the evidence presented by various publishers is of the "personal testimony" variety. When asked what kind of success publishers have had with a given set of materials, they say it has been tried in school system X and that "the teachers like it." Some publishers have even made collections of letters from satisfied teachers as evidence of the success of a given approach. The "research" which goes on in many school systems is no better than the "personal testimony" kind of research, whereby a certain set of materials or a certain gadget is tried out and the teachers somehow come up with the conclusion that "it works." The fact that something works is not good enough. As a matter of fact, with a good teacher practically everything works. What is needed is some sort of controlled experimentation to determine how a certain new approach compares to the customary one, or possibly how it might compare to some other new approach to a given instructional problem. It would appear reasonable to expect that one determine the strengths and weaknesses of a certain set of materials from the standpoint of content and the children for whom it is intended.

It might appear interesting to take a look at how educators arrive at the "it works" conclusion about a certain approach. Apparently what happens is that a certain approach is introduced into the system and some type of evaluation is made, maybe six months or a year later, disclosing that the youngsters improved in the particular characteristic which the system was supposed to teach. We still need to answer the question, however, as to whether the youngsters improved more than if one had left them alone or whether the improvement equaled that of the improvement which would have taken place with practically any kind of instructional material.

It is obviously necessary to get an independent and impartial evaluation of new materials from a financially disinterested party, and the results of this type of study must then be communicated to the educational community.

How Should One Communicate the Results?

It is the responsibility of the researcher to communicate his results to other people in the field of education through the usual professional journals. Unfortunately, there has been

a strong tendency of researchers to write for other researchers rather than for the research consumer. If the results of research are going to be communicated to the educator, they must be communicated in terms which he can understand. Actually, many researchers are afraid of being considered rather unsophisticated if they report the results of their research in a simple, straightforward way. Even in the field of reading there are people who fail to understand that the purpose of written communication is that of communication. It is an investigator's responsibility to present the data which he has collected in such a form that an independent reader can make his own interpretations about the adequacy of the design of a study, the empirical results, the interpretation of the data, etc. The professional school administrator must have sufficient research literacy skills to be able to read and interpret research reports--this is part of being a professional.

Researchers are often uninterested in studying specific sets of instructional materials; they much prefer to study the broader aspects of instruction. One finds, for example, people who are making comparative studies of basal readers versus programed readers for reading instruction. To carry out such a study they choose a series or a set of materials from each of these two systems and make comparisons. At the present time this approach is erroneous because the systems one has now are not sufficiently representative of a generic method; most instructional systems are highly impure. Also, it is a mistake to research a problem at a given grade level and then draw general conclusions about this particular problem for all grade levels. For example, in one study of the components of reading, a researcher could not find a word attack skills component in reading. This finding may be rather surprising to those working with younger children, but it is probably understandable when one notes simply, that the study was done with high school seniors. Much of the research that has been published has dealt with much more specificity than the authors have claimed.

Who Reads Research?

Perhaps the most discouraging aspect of research in the field of reading is the impression that nobody reads it. For example, the research on the improvement of eye movements by mechanical means has produced amazingly consistent results. The research, including comparative studies, has demonstrated that improvement in eye movements is more effective through the media of conventional classroom procedures, using books, than by the use of mechanical devices. Nevertheless, literally millions of dollars are being spent by American educators in the purchase of this kind of equipment, not for further experimentation which might be a legitimate use of these funds but

for mass application. When a school district spends tens of thousands of dollars buying hardware for the study and improvement of eye movements, one would think that whoever made the purchases had somewhere seen some evidence that this investment was worthwhile. It might be too much to expect this person to acquaint himself with all available research literature, but at least he might read one of the summaries of research on this particular piece of equipment.

Who Gets Research Grants?

American educators have been able to convince the federal government that they need money for research and that in the past no industry has spent less money on research than has education. Congress has responded by appropriating large funds for educational experimentation, but the educational community was not prepared to receive this development with staffs of trained researchers. Although many school administrators were trained at the doctoral level, such training had usually been geared toward the realities of their profession as administrators; they had had little opportunity to practice the research skills that they once had learned. To top it all, research support was made available on a year-to-year basis, with the result that few school districts could go out and hire a competent researcher, since they would not be able to offer stable employment.

Most school districts were reluctant to pass up the opportunity to participate in the Washington give-away programs, so they proceeded to apply for federal funds. Since funding was based on a written proposal, many schools proceeded to hire proposal writers, who, in turn, proceeded to propose innovative programs in preschool education, vocational education, remedial reading, cultural enrichment, special education, and many other facets of the school program with which they were equally unfamiliar. The main qualification for these innovative "grant swingers" seemed to be their ability to determine what sort of proposals the government officials wanted and what kind of vocabulary was needed to appear knowledgeable. A similar situation exists in the colleges and universities, but their grantsmanship is marked by much more sophisticated experimental designs. Too many of the so-called innovative programs proposed by the public schools represent rather sloppy research design. On the other hand, the more academic researcher shies away from the classroom because there are so many uncontrollable variables affecting the results that, when he is through, he doesn't know what caused what. To the experimental purist the classroom is too contaminated for a research laboratory, but it is the problems of the classroom that the education profession is primarily interested in solving.

There appears, then, to be a great need for well-designed research studies in the schools, using the skills of the researchers to solve the educational problems of today. Many are looking toward the regional laboratories for the solution, since they were set up to solve such problems. So far, it does not appear that they have been able to come up with good solutions to these problems either because they have not been able to effect a satisfactory merger of research talents. It appears that too many of the positions in these laboratories are being filled with experimental psychologists, who have little or no appreciation of the current problems of the schools and little knowledge of what is already known. Some of these researchers have already spent a couple of years discovering that there are enormous individual differences among the pupils in our schools.

Is there, then, no room for pure research? If by pure research one means the study of some hitherto undiscovered facts or contributing to theory in some way, pure research is badly needed. There are, however, researchers who do research for research's sake, who do a study because nobody else has done it, and who justify this by enumerating the many wonderful things that have come out of "pure research" as byproducts and accidental discoveries by saying "We might just come up with something." Such "going fishing" research, hoping to come up with something, is a misuse of public funds. One can not put that much faith in serendipity.

A Point of View

Such are the research problems which the school administrator should be cognizant of at the present time. Research funds are now available, but there is a great scarcity of competent researchers. One is, however, probably better off in reading than in most other branches of education; for example, money available for research in vocational education could support everybody trained to do such research for about $100,000 per year. The federal government tries to control quality of research, and its acceptance rate of research proposals tends to run about 20 percent. Many federal research agencies have not spent all their funds, primarily because of lack of adequate research proposals--again, another illustration of the lack of good researchers.

Progress in education must be based upon educational empiricism; educational innovation must be studied and evaluated with the best possible educational research methodology. There is, however, a long way to go.

WHAT IS NEEDED IN IN-SERVICE EDUCATION?

Harry T. Hahn
Oakland University

MOST TEACHERS want to be smarter than they are. They want to be a positive force in society--moving boys and girls to greater heights of learning and to loftier ideals. They want the satisfaction and security of knowing that they did a competent job. They want to be recognized for their professional achievements and praised for their unique ideas and contributions. They want to be known as creative people--optimistic, enthusiastic, imaginative, and knowledgeable. They recognize that, like children, their motivators must be frequently oiled and their repertoire of pregnant and exciting ideas constantly replenished. They want and need help in developing programs suited to their personalities, programs which allow them the dignity of self-commitment as well as those for which they can see a purpose.

It would be facetious to suggest that a mink stole, a trip to Bermuda, a color television set, or a cash prize might provide teachers with inducements for greater effectiveness in instruction. However, it is apparent that administrators need to be as aggressive and as personal as the dealer with a new car franchise in maintaining the zest for discovery and the zeal for professional involvement together with finding suitable rewards for outstanding achievement.

Some years ago, a fine elementary school principal, who was interested in helping his staff gain new insights to learning, took a cue from teachers' talk and encouraged a simple research project intended to examine the effect of weather upon pupil performance. The study consisted of teachers recording their general disposition at the start of the school day and noting the weather outside. At the close of the day they reported on the general disposition of their students. The records were maintained by a secretary for a few weeks and analyzed by the principal. Was it the weather or the disposition of the teacher which influenced the daily behavior of pupils? The evidence collected was conclusive: the teacher's feelings and attitudes at the start of the school day, rather than the weather, set the stage for instruction. The recent 27 Office of Education first grade studies, like many studies which preceded these, provided similar evidence. The prime mover in instruction is the teacher, not a particular teaching method, device, or text. What happens when she closes her

classroom door because of her moral, interests, concerns, points of view, and, above all, her personal commitment to the work at hand determines to a large extent the learning which takes place. Teachers need not fear being replaced by large computers or complex programed learning materials--young people will always need living, breathing, inspiring models whose vibrant hearts exude compassion for learning. The important and perplexing question for administrators is how to develop and maintain a lively interest and consistent concern among the staff for ongoing daily activity and to keep the glow of discovery and wonderment alive.

This paper contains the personal view of the writer drawn from more than twelve years' experience on a full-time basis in promoting and conducting in-service teacher education programs. These have been wonderful years in which at times the writer may have become more of an authority on what not to do than on what is really important. Much of what passes for in-service training seems to be inconsequential and may often be damaging to teacher egos. Because teachers ask practical questions about daily procedures and materials, one may be led to believe that they merely want cookbook recipes, panaceas, or detailed outlines of what to do next. This is not so, for teachers are realists and know there is no easy way to solve difficult instructional problems. The most naive in-service programs are those in which teachers gather to discover exactly how the author wants his materials taught and then have supervisors (spies) from the central office visit classrooms to make sure that the author's subjects (teachers) follow the steps he prescribed in his royal know-it-all style. What a horrible way to rob the profession of its dignity.

Speakers that inspire, conferences which bombard or spray useful ideas, demonstrations which show, workshops which develop materials and know-how, meetings which focus on specific issues, individual and small group conferences which identify problem areas are all needed in a strong in-service training program to open new doors to effective teaching and to reinforce and extend concepts in daily practice. Towards this goal the writer has selected five words to reveal the administrators' role in the in-service process--going, growing, glowing, crowing, and knowing.

The administrator gets teachers <u>going</u> by demonstrating a tireless interest in the daily problems which they face and by consistently supplying, if possible, the materials and help they need. He gets them <u>growing</u> by frequently focusing attention on some areas of general concern to his faculty through workshops, speakers, discussions, films, and other ways open to him. He gets teachers <u>glowing</u> by discussing what has happened with useful ideas by classroom visits and by occasionally using the tape recorder, Polaroid, Instamatic, or 8mm

movie camera, or, if possible, a video tape recorder to preserve certain results and achievements. He gets them crowing (talking enthusiastically) by having them share their achievements in informal and planned teacher and parent meetings. He knows that the feedback will provide assistance and encouragement to others and should be a source of excitement for proud mothers and fathers. Finally, he gets them knowing by collecting evidence of all the excellent practices they tried and showing how these serve as integral parts of the children's education.

Recommendations

There are many important elements of in-service training which might be treated in this paper. However, in this writer's opinion, there is none more pressing and perplexing than the follow-up and follow-through stages of teacher development. It is in the answer to the "what happens next?" questions that the true value of meetings, lectures, workshops, and other in-service practices are demonstrated. The following recommendations are limited to this aspect of what is needed for in-service education:

1. Schools need well-stocked learning resource centers staffed with two or more highly competent teachers and two or more clerical assistants. One center should be maintained for each school in the district. There is nothing more frustrating for the inspired teacher who returns from an exciting workshop to find that she does not have the time, equipment, materials, or know-how to launch a new thought into orbit. Most ideas die for the lack of fuel to keep them alive. A learning resource center can assure her of immediate and continued assistance. The learning center staff can help prepare overlays, tapes, demonstrations, questions, filmstrips, and publications and organize large and small group work in such ways that were never before possible. This writer has worked with teachers using this concept in Farmington, Michigan, and can attest to the wonderful morale and lively instructional programs in these schools. Imagine children having access to private secretaries to dictate their ideas! The learning center provides this service. Indeed, in this writer's opinion, learning centers are a far more profitable investment than the employment of a staff of remedial reading teachers who contribute so little to the daily school program. There is a word of caution, however. Merely providing the space, books, equipment, and personnel is not enough to assure success of the center's activity. Teachers need an extensive in-service program to discover how to make the best use of the new personnel and supplies. What is more, they need center personnel who are eager to work with teachers and children alike. This is an exciting and different teacher-team idea.

The center deserves top priority in in-service planning.

2. Teachers need assurance that the top administrative staff knows that they are doing outstanding work. It would be a tremendous boon to in-service education if the superintendent of the district would plan to visit classrooms frequently to show interest and concern for the programs which are being conducted. If he cannot find time, he needs to appoint a director of staff and faculty development, just below him in rank, to devote all of his time and energy to discover in a very positive, as well as warm and reassuring way, what is happening to boys and girls. This person might well follow the lead of a fourth grade teacher who had tremendous success in developing an unusual program in creative writing. She used a red pencil to tell each student what she admired most in his composition no matter how it was written--"My, John, I am delighted you started this sentence with a capital letter." She scrupulously avoided all inclinations to tell them what they did wrong. She knew how to keep them glowing and found a natural way to knowing. Similarly, the new director should be most sensitive to the emotional and intellectual needs of teachers and most appreciative of their efforts. This proposal might lead to a hall of fame for a district's teachers, as well as a teacher-of-the-month recognition plan. Once more the teacher is the most important element i the instructional program. Here is where one must invest reso rces.

3. Administrators must find ways to develop and continue some very active research projects involving teachers and children. Let teachers explore and discover what is best for themselves. Teachers involved in research are often working at their tiptoe level in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of an exciting method, procedure, or plan. Get teachers involved in discovering what works, for the enthusiasm for research rubs off on children. Some uncomplicated procedures for conducting interesting classroom research are discussed in Educational Research for Classroom Teachers by John Barnes, A. P. Putnam & Sons, New York, 1960. Unfortunately, instead of researching practices which may work for boys and girls, many districts drain energy and teacher talent into endless rounds of committee meetings seeking a consensus on materials and plans, often arriving at decisions which few would personally endorse. Decisions made from teacher studies are far superior to those coming out of committee meetings. This writer has had personal experience in classroom-oriented research which has effected important changes in the curriculum for an entire district because of the excitement stirred by a few teachers involved in researching reading practices.

4. In measuring the results of in-service instruction, administrators should seek tests and related devices which measure what the teachers are really trying to do. At the close of

the year is no time to test what the teachers are teaching. In an examination of questions on standardized tests, one notes the similarity of the material to that which is found in workbook exercises. Very few standardized tests, if any, measure critical thinking, creative writing, effective listening, oral expression, logical thinking in content areas, etc. Researchers like Walter Loban, Ruth Strickland, Kellogg Hunt, Paul Torrance, and others are giving clues as to how to measure speaking, writing, listening, and creativity. One can find many ways to measure what is taught. Currently this writer has been considering an interesting approach to helping kindergarten and first grade teachers observe the behavior of very young students. It would consist of a two- or three-week workshop in which teachers with guidance would be shown how to give three tests: Marianne Frostig's Developmental Test of Visual Perception, Newell Kephart's Perceptual Survey Rating Scale, and Samuel Kirk's Illinois Tests of Psycho-Linguistic Activities. The program would not aim at mastery or a full understanding of these interests but would point to areas of early childhood which are important in learning.

5. Watch for warning signs which may indicate that a program has outlived its usefulness in challenging teachers. When they start taking the instructional practices for granted and no longer talk excitedly about their work, the danger flag is flying high and it is time for major surgery or new stimulation. Perhaps one of the most significant contributions to the new mathematics program is the importance it places upon teachers' learning new ways to teach numerical facts. The revitalized program made in-service training an absolute necessity. What is more, the teachers' discoveries were so intriguing and, at times, baffling that the spirit of exploration was transferred to the classroom and the excitement of a new idea was captured by the boys and girls. Two and two were not necessarily four! How come? Some research has shown that new spelling programs begin sharply tapering off within two or three years of their introduction. Because it is known that there is no one best way for getting the job done in reading, administrators should make frequent changes in reading programs, as well as with in-service training.

"Why settle for one dish when you can have smorgasbord?" This writer favors the approach that would give teachers a choice of methods and materials they will use during the year. These should be lush times in education, and one need not settle for a Spartan diet. Teacher commitment, rather than district commitment, makes more sense, particularly if the administrator is alert to the basic needs of faculty members.

6. Administrators must find a positive way to evaluate instruction and possibly provide teachers with techniques for self-evaluation. A device which may serve as a model for a

study of the kinds of services teachers provide children is entitled A Teacher Service Analysis, developed by Donald Durrell and others at Boston University. The purpose of this survey was to help administrators find a reliable guide for examining the nature of services provided for the classroom. It shows concern for classroom organization, progress rate, special weaknesses, self-direction, and enrichment services for pupils. This device must be personalized in terms of individual district and school programs. It could lead to the development of an effective self-evaluation scale in which teachers would note elements of a well-balanced program.

7. This writer would not minimize the importance of inspiring themes and thoughtful words which may have temporary, but often a compelling quality, for in-service activity. Teachers have been inspired to go "On Beyond Zebra" and have changed these famous words of John Paul Jones to read: "We have not yet begun to read!"

The Frenchman who came to America in the 19th century exhorting people to start each morning with the advice "Every day in every way I'm getting better and better" undoubtedly had some effect on the lives of the people. Indeed, words-to-live-by is no idle concept as any football coach with a winning team knows. However, the principal can't get into a huddle with his faculty each morning to suggest, "Let's get in there and teach!" but his demeanor and actions may reflect that his slogan is "Let's try once more, once more, once more, and this time with feeling! Isn't there another way to do that?" A teacher's reach should exceed his grasp or what's a principal for--with all due respects to Elizabeth Browning.

8. Finally, administrators need to be on the lookout for vacuous ideas which leave instructional programs exactly as they were when the in-service program started--untouched. Activities which come under the head of grouping, groping, and griping could well fall into this category. One can spend a great deal of time organizing groups of pupils--heterogeneously, homogeneously, or what-have-you hoping that the teachers might feel comfortable with the limited instruction they have to offer. Such practices seldom have a positive influence for they leave young minds unmarked. There are many ways to cut a cake, but it will taste the same no matter how it is sliced. To improve the cake, one must examine the ingredients and baking methods. Teachers want assistance when it counts.

The enemies of effective instruction are frustration, procrastination, apathy, indifference, daily teacher rituals imposed by the central office, together with an environment which has long since become glum and lusterless by neglect. Neglect comes from those who feel that all one needs are four walls, a

roof, a few books, some inadequate blackboards, desks, and a teacher. In such schools the teacher is on her own from the day she is employed until she retires. She may attend occasional teacher meetings to get the word on exactly how she should do her job, but unless she can keep within herself a healthy perspective of what the future holds for the young Lincolns who are sitting in her classroom, she may give up and do a mediocre job against her better judgment. I am convinced that there are few teachers who want this to happen. Spirited and resourceful in-service programs that dignify our profession are sound investments in the future of America.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR AND THE READING TEACHER

Walter J. McHugh

California State College at Hayward

THE POSITION of today's principal is practically untenable. He must change his thinking, his role, and his commitment to needed teaching innovations for children--especially in reading. As Dr. Avery has stated: "They must say it, mean it, and then, implement it." Talk is not enough. Implementing changes requires retraining principals to truly play the role of instructional leader rather than merely hold that title.

Need for In-service Education

Mounting pressures from many directions are forcing principals to examine carefully their reading programs. Recent research, new programs, technologies, systems, and strategies for implementing improved programs combined with massive federal and state financial windfalls have placed a difficult burden on the school principal. He must, in many situations, plan and implement an "innovative and exemplary" program in reading. He must also see that new funds for reading are well spent.

How well equipped is the principal to meet this challenge? In far too many situations, the principal is poorly trained for the emerging school curriculum that is rapidly developing. He has the title of "instructional leader" but neither the skills nor breadth and depth of background in each curriculum area to prepare himself for the problems he faces. For example, he probably has taken only one course in reading as an undergraduate many years ago. His individual efforts at study and reading to "keep up" with curriculum changes are probably too little and too late. How can he possibly keep well informed in every curriculum area? For the position of principal he took course work long before appointment to the principalship. For most principals their course-taking ended when their administrative position began. Due to the type of training colleges dispense the principal is further handicapped in that he has little or no understanding of primary grade reading--especially beginning reading instruction. He tends to spend less time in primary grades than in intermediate grades. He avoids giving specific help and evaluation in primary reading. He is somewhat fearful and uncomfortable and considers supervision of primary grade reading programs either too sensitive or too delicate. Yet, few will argue

the point that primary grade reading instruction is by far the most crucial level in a comprehensive reading program.

The principal's plight is not of his own making. Although one can be critical of this situation, the last to be blamed might well be the principal.

Whom does the principal turn to for help? For many years principals sought aid from either a supervisor, consultant, or coordinator to help his teachers and his reading programs. More often than not this endeavor proved both discouraging and disappointing. Consultants, for the most part, are spread too thin--too many schools, too many teachers, too many subjects to supervise. Unfortunately, in many states consultant services are so poor that a supervisor has little impact on instruction within a school. Most supervisors must devote much time to meetings and to poor and/or new teachers. A further handicap in helping principals exists because supervisors are unable to follow through and maintain continuity of instructional practice, and their visits to a particular school are usually spread over periods of time too extended for maximum effectiveness. Although supervisory personnel possess excellent skills and know-how, they are often frustrated by the large numbers of teachers and principals to whom they are assigned to help.

How does the teacher improve her reading program? Left mainly to her own devices, the teacher seeks professional improvement principally through course taking and, when available, district-run in-service workshops and institutes.

How effective have these traditional attempts at upgrading reading programs proved to be? Those involved with the training and supervision of student teaching would probably answer in chorus--minimal. Those who teach both undergraduate and graduate methods courses in reading are quite fearful of visiting former students in their classrooms because they know all too well that little of what was preached has become practice. This situation was illustrated recently by a colleague who spent three hours lecturing and giving his students specific tests, plans, materials, and techniques for individualizing spelling instruction. One month later he asked his fifty in-service teachers how many of them had changed their spelling program. Not one had changed! Every teacher was that week teaching Lesson 28 in spelling to all children--same page, same pace, whether individual students needed it or not.

Is this the best one can do? Are there not more efficient and effective techniques available to help implement new reading programs? Teachers take courses, learn new techniques, and then are either afraid to try them or are not allowed to. Isolated individual course-taking by teachers does not appear

to be a particularly successful attack for improving reading instruction.

New Concepts of In-service Education

The need to improve in-service education in reading is accepted by most school authorities. A program design to accomplish this goal needs to be planned with imagination to accommodate wide ranges of pupil ability, teacher interest, competency, and experience. Additionally, someone must assume the role of instructional leader, change agent, and evaluator. This challenge falls squarely on the school principal. No other person can assume this role. This thesis is based on the premise that if improved school practice in reading is to be achieved, the principal, far more than any other person, is the chief agent and the only person close enough to actual classroom situations to bring about needed change. Therefore, it follows, that the principal as well as the teacher needs additional skill in directing efforts to improve reading instruction.

Some of the obstacles to improved teaching of reading within a school are created by the school principal. Over a period of ten years of teaching in-service courses for teachers, one repeatedly hears such comments on attempted changes as

1. "My principal won't let me try it. He's worried about the other teachers."
2. "My principal doesn't know what I'm doing."
3. "My principal gives me no support or encouragement in trying new ideas."
4. "Although I've learned a great deal about new ideas and techniques for teaching reading, there is no way for me to share these with other teachers."
5. "My principal doesn't understand what I'm doing. He doesn't know how to evaluate my reading program."
6. "My principal is so busy running the school he has almost no time to spend on instruction."

Even if one discounts some comments as the words of teachers making excuses for their own resistance to change, the indictment remains valid. The writer enjoyed the opportunity to try some inventive ideas in an attempt to solve some of the problems of in-service education in reading. Several factors provided this climate for innovation. First, accepting a position at the new California State College at Hayward, gave the opportunity to design new courses in reading; encouragement and support from college officials enhanced creative course designs. Secondly, the San Francisco Bay area schools have extensive district and county in-service workshops and institutes in reading. These school districts often call on college personnel to serve as consultants and workshop

leaders. As a result of these excellent conditions during the past six years, cooperative efforts between college and school district personnel have allowed for the emergence of some promising approaches to in-service education in reading.

Basic Premise in Developing New In-service Programs

The prime objective in initiating new designs for in-service education was to provide opportunities for both principals and teachers to develop and implement improved reading programs in their schools. Much greater understanding and transfer to classroom use take place when both teacher and principal have a common knowledge of newer practices in the teaching of reading. Dual or "team" enrollment in laboratory type courses has many advantages over an individual's taking a lecture course. The principal serves as a catalyst for change. The teacher has encouragement and support for her efforts. Team efforts (i.e., principal-teacher teams, trained to work together in improving reading instruction) have significantly greater impact on improving a school program than do an individual's lone effort. The unusual design and requirements of team enrollment have further chain-reaction transference to other teachers in the school. The dual enrollment design provided for two different types of programs, team enrollments in college courses and district in-service institutes.

Team Enrollments in College Courses

Beginning Reading Instruction. The first effort at planning a college course for team enrollments attempted to attack the problem of beginning reading instruction. This course was designed for first grade teachers and their principals. Dual enrollment was required. The emphasis of the course was on preventing reading failure at this crucial period in the child's schooling. It was also felt that principals needed more help in this area of reading than in any other. This course, titled Beginning Reading Instruction, afforded principals an opportunity to learn about the latest research in reading, diagnostic procedures, and the principal's role in aiding teachers and improving the reading program.

Plans, materials, and techniques were given teachers for specific instruction in September analysis of reading needs of pupils, informal tests for grouping children in reading, teaching children to listen, auditory and visual discrimination, maintaining a large sight vocabulary, meaningful seatwork activities, phonics and word analysis skills, assuring comprehension and recall in oral and silent reading, and individualized and independent reading programs.

Plans, materials, and techniques were given to principals to aid him in providing instructional leadership in improving

services to pupils and teachers, assuring teacher acceptability of improved service to pupils, planning of effective demonstration of new services, cooperative planning with teacher groups, developing and adapting instructional materials for pupil needs, planning follow-up activities to assure teacher use of effective practices, evaluating teacher services to instructional needs of pupils, and developing supervisory skills in working with primary grade teachers.

Activities of the course included lectures, demonstrations conducted by the instructor with first grade children, exhibits, discussions, evaluation of new reading materials, and production of materials and plans for classroom use. Occasionally separate sessions were held with principals to discuss and exchange ideas and plans. Teachers, during these sessions, were given work periods for exchanging ideas and materials.

The results of this first effort at required team enrollment in in-service courses in reading proved most rewarding. At first, principals were highly resistant and most skeptical. No doubt, many principals were "forced into" taking this course. When principals realized they were to receive specific help, their fears disappeared and their interest became quite obvious. Course evaluations proved most valuable. From principals, teachers received increased encouragement, praise, and sympathetic understanding coupled with much support and enthusiasm for trying new techniques and ideas. Principals felt that such a course provided them with more skill and knowledge in supervising a reading program, evaluating teacher service, and especially, ability to assist other teachers in the building. No longer were they fearful of helping teachers with reading in primary grades. This course, first tried as an extension course, is now a regular graduate level course at the college and is accepted towards the master's program for reading specialists.

Based on the encouraging results of this first attempt at team enrollment courses, two additional programs were developed.

NDEA Institute for Teacher-Principal-Supervisor Teams

California State College at Hayward received a grant to conduct an institute in advanced study in reading for disadvantaged youth. The institute was limited to 66 people, comprising a maximum of 22 teams (each team consisted of a teacher, her principal, and a district supervisor). The unusual design of the institute and requirements of participants in the institute were designed for maximum <u>impact</u> on a particular school and, further, for an ever-widening effect on an entire school district.

The activities of the institute were scheduled to allow appropriate time blocks planned for lecture, group discussions, problem solving and interaction, materials production, laboratory activity, field trips, visits to schools and reading clinics, observation and participation in the reading clinic, and study of the reading materials collection at the college.

The objectives of the institute were to improve the competence of the reading teams in providing instructional leadership for improving reading services; to provide participants with plans and materials to implement actual changes in classroom practice; to study, analyze, criticize, and evaluate new materials and media; to design, write, and share teacher-made materials, instructional aids, guides and programs aimed at school, district, and local dissemination; to train the reading teams to conduct demonstration lessons and workshops and utilize materials; to train supervisors and principals in techniques of evaluating teacher service to pupils; and to train teams in diagnosing and planning programs to correct reading difficulties.

Flexible scheduling allowed for team members to work individually, with their counterparts from other teams, and as a teacher-principal-supervisory team. A sample assignment devised for this institute follows:

"You and your team are to plan a program--a detailed plan of attack regarding the method of implementation you will institute in your school community. Included will be a detailed plan for curriculum meetings, demonstrations, materials to be used, and methods of evaluation. You will limit this plan of implementation to 1) prereading background skills, 2) reading readiness, and 3) beginning reading instruction. Show how you will utilize the talents of your staff regarding the differentiation of instruction. Outline the supervisory techniques you will utilize."

The evaluation of the institute was a two-phased program. Weekly evaluation by participants pointed out the strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for planning the following week's program. Staff evaluation and planning also evidenced needed areas for reemphasis and expansion. Assignments from students were perhaps the key to assessment of the effectiveness of the institute. Materials developed by individuals and teams were corrected, edited, sometimes rewritten, and then distributed to all teams. This method presented every team with a wide variety of ideas, plans, and materials that could be adopted for school use. The high quality of work from participants was proof to the staff of the value of the team efforts. At the end of the institute each participant completed an unsigned, detailed evaluation form. Three points received almost unanimous support: 1) the team enrollment concept, 2)

new knowledge gained in teaching reading, and 3) plans and materials to take back and implement in their schools. The second phase of evaluating the institute involves field evaluation of the teams. Funds were budgeted to visit and evaluate the impact of the institute in the schools and communities of the enrollees. This evaluation is scheduled to take place near the end of this school year. Preliminary reports and letters, in advance of the formal on-site visitations, have been very encouraging and enthusiastic.

Team Enrollments in District and County In-service Workshops

School districts in California frequently call on college personnel to direct workshops and to give lectures and courses for teachers in reading. Teachers attend these workshops after school and usually receive credit for professional improvement on a salary schedule. Although there is a distinct need for in-service work in reading, typical methods of providing this service have not proved overly satisfactory. The disadvantages of a one- or two-hour after-school workshop, where tired teachers come to listen and then go home, are obvious. Disadvantages weigh heavily against the advantages. The speaker dispenses inspiration--usually short-lived--and usually is unable to give specific plans, ideas, or techniques that teachers can take back to their classrooms. "One shot" attempts at this type of workshop have little or no continuing impact on improving reading services. Teachers who come usually just warm chairs. They have no commitment and little encouragement to try new things in their classrooms. Most often, the school principal is absent from such in-service gatherings and, thereby is in no position to follow through. This situation becomes more prevalent as more federal and state monies are given to school districts for consultant services. Many times, more emphasis is placed on spending the money by a certain date than the manner in which it is spent.

In order to eliminate some of the disadvantages and weaknesses noted, new and improved approaches to in-service programs in reading were designed. A program designed to meet the individual needs of Castro Valley School District is described below.

The Castro Valley Program

There were two main objectives in this program: 1) to train the principals to be instructional leaders in reading and 2) to improve the teacher's classroom reading program. All principals were required to attend all sessions. This program was spread out over a school year. The college consultant worked in the district two days each week. The schedule for the first half of the year follows:

Monday Evening. Two-hour lecture and demonstration for teachers and principals. The first hour the consultant gave a demonstration with groups of children--utilizing techniques and materials that teachers could take back to their classroom and implement in their reading programs. The second hour was devoted to lecture, discussion of additional methods and materials, and a question and answer period.

Tuesday. At individual schools during regular faculty meetings, questions and problems concerning the Monday evening lecture-demonstration were "fed-back" to all the participant's colleagues.

Wednesday. Principals, supervisors, the director of elementary education, and consultant met for two-hour periods. These sessions were centered on determining instructional levels in reading, techniques for supervising the reading program, and methods of evaluating teacher service.

One day each week. Visitation by the consultant, principals, and supervisors. Each visited classrooms, observed teaching methods, talked with teachers, and made suggestions for improving teachers' programs.

Additional activities during the year consisted of lectures, discussions, and demonstrations for 1) developing a balanced reading program, 2) checking instructional grouping and ability levels of children in classrooms, 3) preventing reading failure in grade one, 4) methods of evaluating pupil progress, 5) designing methods to fit special needs, 6) building and trying out supplementary materials, and 7) evaluating new reading programs.

All teachers did not attend the Monday evening workshops. Primary and intermediate grade teachers attended on alternate weeks.

The second half of the school year was devoted to training principals to assume the instructional leadership of the reading program in his school. This section was particularly necessary as rapid teacher turnover produces an almost entirely new school faculty every three or four years. To appoint an outside college consultant every four years is neither economically feasible nor educationally defensible. Therefore, the responsibility for the ongoing reading program was destined to be placed with the school principal. During this same period the principals, supervisors, consultant, and selected teachers developed a curriculum guide in reading, a major undertaking since all district policies, testing, lesson plans, and supplementary teaching aids were included in the guide. Over seventy sets of materials were developed to aid teachers in improving their reading program. This guide has proved to be very useful.

The principals and the consultant continued to visit classrooms, exchange ideas, and suggest improvements one day per week on an informal schedule.

Some Notes on Evaluation

Attempts to evaluate the effects of both the college and district in-service programs are difficult. "Testimonials" are always easy to acquire. Test scores tell only part of the story.

In the Castro Valley program, separate evaluations by teachers and principals not only measured increasing first grade reading achievement (first grade received considerable emphasis in this program) but also proved to be highly complimentary. A full report of this program was presented to the board of education by school personnel. The report stated that the program was one of the most successful in-service programs the district had had. Perhaps the best measures of success are the extent to which both principals and teachers have improved the school program, the level of achievement, interest, and commitment and the community satisfaction with the reading program. Research designers have yet to devise acceptable ways of truly measuring the effects of such programs--especially over an extended period of time.

Factors Necessary for Success

For those professors who might be interested in developing team enrollment courses for college-district in-service education in reading, several cautions are warranted. Most important is to obtain the strong commitment and support of the superintendent of schools. Without this, even the best of efforts of others fail. Secondly, is to acquire a college consultant who can show what he talks about--a consultant who can demonstrate with children, who is not fearful of going into a classroom to face the same problems a teacher faces, and who gives practical help. Ivory-towered, theoretical, research-oriented professors are of little value in giving specific help to teachers. One needs to develop more consultants who are equally secure in both college and school classrooms. We need to encourage many of our professors, who previously were creative classroom teachers, to move back more closely to school and classroom environments--those described by Conant as the "clinical professor."

Team enrollment courses are not immediately popular with college deans and department heads. In most colleges, course innovation requires two to three years from inception to inclusion in college catalogs. Many such new course designs are relegated to summer sessions and off-campus extension programs.

Summary

The in-service programs reported here are an invitation to other school districts and colleges to explore the possibilities of team enrollments in attempting to improve the teaching of reading. They hold promise, challenge, power, and rewards.

FUNDING THE PROGRAM

Doris Gunderson
U.S. Office of Education

ALTHOUGH MOST READERS are familiar with the ESEA of 1965 and its provisions, a few of the titles and some of the exciting and interesting programs supported by the titles merit elaboration.

Title I provides federal grants for projects in low income areas to improve the instruction of educationally deprived children in public and nonpublic schools.

Title III provides grants for supplemental services to enable schools to have programs which embody original ideas and enrich courses of study not otherwise available.

Title IV amends the Cooperative Research Act, one of the older programs in the Office of Education. Research has always been the basis of progress. The purposes of the program include broadening the scope of educational research, providing grants for training educational researchers, and aiding in payment for construction of related facilities.

Title IV also includes the R&D centers and regional educational laboratories which are associations of colleges and universities, state departments of education, schools, and other organizations in a geographical area working together to meet educational needs through research, development, and dissemination. Currently there is a network of twenty regional educational laboratories throughout the United States.

Title XI of the NDEA provides federal support for institutes for teachers in the public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools of the country. The institutes are conducted by colleges and universities under contract with the USOE. The twelve areas included in Title XI are Civics, Disadvantaged Youth, Economics, Educational Media, English, English for Speakers of Other Languages, Geography, History, Industrial Arts, Modern Foreign Languages, Reading, and School Library Personnel. In 1965, fifty-three institutes in reading were held while sixty-six were held in 1966. Fifty-four reading institutes were conducted during the summer of 1967 and the 1967-68 academic year. Approximately 1800 teachers, supervisors, and administrators attended the fifty-four 1967-68 institutes. Out of fifty-four institutes, twenty-nine were for elementary teachers; ten, for secondary teachers; and fif-

teen, for teachers in both elementary and secondary schools.

Reading is a large component of many ESEA Title I and III projects. Approximately fifty-nine percent of the Title I projects involve or include language arts or reading programs. In Detroit, students in grades four through twelve receive help at three communications skills centers located in low-income attendance areas. A language retardation unit for ten preschool children has been established in one of the sub-centers. Only preschool children with symbolic language problems participate. They meet in groups of two or three, receive individual attention, and are exposed to an intensive language stimulation program. Language therapy is provided by speech correction specialists, and active parental participation is required. This pilot program may pave the way for more research in the area since staff members will test the children during the year and analyze tapes of the children's speech. A first grade reading and demonstration project is also being conducted in Detroit. Six different methods of teaching reading are being used in fifteen elementary schools. Additional materials, consultant services, and teacher aides are provided. In addition, teachers receive in-service training. Hopefully, the in-depth evaluation of the six reading programs, which include standardized testing, will provide the Detroit schools with evidence as to the effectiveness of each of the techniques.

A Title I remedial reading program inaugurated in Atlanta provided intensive training for "lead" reading teachers. The lead teachers then were assigned to selected schools to train faculty members to work with students. The students served by the program attended forty elementary schools in areas of concentrated economic deprivation having the highest percentages of fourth and sixth grade pupils reading below grade level. The lead teachers examined test scores of a school before making plans for implementing a student remedial reading program and conducted special in-service courses for faculty members in several schools during school hours. Facilities in the four communications skills centers located within poverty pockets were utilized by the lead reading teachers in their work with both classroom teachers and students. Approximately one third of the school population in Atlanta was affected by the programs which included, among its objectives, improving the communication and linguistic skills of pupils, upgrading teacher competency in teaching reading, increasing the effectiveness of the overall instructional program, and promoting teachers' understanding of the sociological, psychological, and anthropological aspects of cultural deprivation.

A mobile language arts classroom was used in Magdalena, New Mexico. The majority of the children in the school district lived on the 52,500-acre Alamo Indian Reservation. Poverty

has long been a way of life in the district; in the entire history of the Alamo people only five students have ever been graduated from high school. Continuous failure in school and family need for income from children's labor were contributing factors to the enormous dropout rate. The mobile classroom, moving from one settlement to another during the summer months, enabled the Indian students to catch up in their academic work. The summer remedial programs in language arts and mathematics combined with several new programs during the school year should greatly increase, in the future, the number of students graduating from high school.

A number of school districts are concentrating their efforts on what might be termed "breaking the language barrier." English is not the native language of many children in the United States. The usual problems of adjusting to school are magnified for children who enter school with little or no knowledge of English. In Tuba City, Arizona, Indian children constitute ninety percent of the elementary school population. According to school officials, the majority of the Indian children test from one to two years below their grade level and in the lower fifteenth percentile. In an attempt to meet the needs of these educationally deprived children, a communications center was established. Children from ages six to thirteen listened to tapes, responded orally, and watched visual presentations. The laboratory training was reinforced by classroom work. Teachers at the secondary level, in a similar program, concentrated on language, intonational forms, and vocabulary development.

Another project designed to overcome problems shared by American Indians and Spanish-American students for whom English is a second language was conducted in Gallup, New Mexico. Teacher orientation and in-service training were involved. Thirty preschool groups were initiated to teach English and orient children to school life and prereading activities. Specialists in language and reading provided assistance to students and teachers. Aides assumed some noninstructional duties formerly carried out by teachers. Laboratories and learning materials centers were established, and testing services and evaluation were provided.

In Kayenta, Arizona, school officials felt that Indian children "needed to retain respect and pride in their own culture" in living in a bicultural environment. However, living in a bicultural environment necessitates ease in communication in English since it is the language used by the majority of the population. To achieve this end, the project concentrated upon developmental, corrective, and remedial means to enable students to attain a degree of proficiency in English.

Approximately ninety-five percent of the students in the

Indian Oasis, Arizona, school district are from homes where English is the second language. The tribal jail on the edge of the school grounds was renovated for a more constructive use and now houses the Language Laboratory Center. Facilities of the center used by the students should enable them to become more proficient in English, a condition which in turn should help them to achieve in school.

The El Paso public schools established an Applied Research Language Center to work on the problems not only of teaching English as a second language but also of improving the quality of Spanish of native speakers. The basic philosophy of the center is that the experiences of the Spanish speaking children and the knowledge of a language and culture, are strengths upon which education should be built. First grade children at one school spent forty-five minutes a day at the center which is equipped with responsers and electronic consoles. Non-English speaking high school students, formerly enrolled in oral English classes, used the center to accelerate their progress in acquiring sufficient proficiency to enter the regular school program. A third group using the center was composed of teachers and school administrators who were learning Spanish. In addition, twenty bilingual teachers who wished their English to be free of the intonation, inflection, and rhythm that characterize a Spanish accent used the electronic consoles for that purpose.

A new program supported by the USOE is the National Program in Early Childhood Education. Theories of child development have changed during recent years from an emphasis on social and emotional behavior to an emphasis on intellectual and language behavior. The concern for the educational success of economically disadvantaged children has led to a demand for the expansion of early childhood programs for disadvantaged children to provide them with the antecedents of school success. The demands have resulted in programs, such as Head Start, for disadvantaged young children.

Early childhood curriculum patterns are being revised, modified, and reexamined in an attempt to determine the principles upon which programs for young children should be based.

Because basic questions concerning the behavior and development of very young children remain unanswered, standards of quality in basic and applied research must be raised; facts rather than fads should be emphasized; and practical programs implemented.

The National Program in Early Childhood Education has been established by the Bureau of Research to fill the need for organizational effort in this area. The program structure provides for the coordination and cooperation of individual research and development centers in several locations. The

centers represent diverse philosophies and approaches to early childhood education as well as varieties of focus on such areas as basic research, curriculum development, and research on teacher training.

A National Coordination Center at the University of Illinois will facilitate communication among the centers. An Educational Research Information Center, part of the ERIC network, is also in operation there. The individual centers are located at the University of Arizona, Cornell University, Syracuse University, George Peabody College for Teachers, New York University, and the University of Chicago.

The programs encompass several dimensions from basic to applied research and demonstration programs, focus on the home environment and on a target population versus on an educational problem area, and maintain a field study approach versus educational practice. Interactions are apparent between various centers, and coordination among the centers is planned.

The program at Cornell will involve four areas: 1) basic research in cognitive and social development from infancy through early childhood; 2) research and development of nursery school curricula; 3) research and development of interventive techniques for work with parents; and 4) dissemination of curriculum materials to professionals and community leaders involved in planning and implementing programs for preschool children, youth, and adults. Among the many activities will be a story-reading project for two-year-old culturally deprived children using teenage story readers. This technique increases the verbal competence of the children. Research will be conducted concerning the type of material which is most beneficial. Evaluation of existing materials will be made rather than developing new materials.

At the University of Chicago, research projects falling into four categories will be conducted: research on training processes; research on cognitive, language, and conceptual development; research on social and cultural influences on early education; and instrumentation, research methodology and technology. Studies of language development in the early years will be centered upon processes of language selection, i.e., selection of language responses by the child versus selection of non-language behavior on the basis of language input.

The University of Arizona Center will focus its research upon a definition of the factors involved in the discrepancy between the culture of the Mexican-American subpopulation and the larger society which hinders the Mexican-American child's educational progress. The university with the cooperation of the Tucson School District plans to modify the curriculum for the six-year-old Mexican-American child. The curriculum is being developed and used in twenty-six classrooms in fifteen

schools.

Research at Syracuse will center on the identification and experimental manipulation of the specific antecedent conditions which produce organisms who possess specific capabilities and behavioral predispositions. Cognitive behavior will receive major emphasis although social-emotional development will also be studied.

The center at New York University will continue work that has been carried on at the Institute for Developmental Studies. The institute has been involved in research, training, curriculum development, and demonstration with emphasis upon the influence of environment on developmental and learning processes of children. The relationship of language systems, sensory and perceptual processes, and social and home environments to school performance and intellectual growth will be emphasized.

A six-part project is in progress at the George Peabody Center. The program involves a training program for mothers of deprived children, detailed home observations in rural and urban deprived homes, studies of the interaction between Negro deprived children and the examiner in standardized test situations and learning tasks, the development of a methodology for teaching cognitive development, a study of the personality and intellectual variables relating to the performance of deprived children, and studies of teacher effectiveness and development of a training program for nonprofessional classroom aides.

Some activity in the teaching of reading is being carried on in regional educational laboratories. The majority of the programs are directed toward that segment of the population which is termed the culturally or educationally disadvantaged. Two of the laboratories focus their programs on groups identified as urban disadvantaged and three, on the rural disadvantaged. Development and testing across the full range of cultural and socioeconomic groups of the region is being carried on in one program. Generally, the activities involve research, development, and testing. Training of teachers usually assumes a secondary role. The grade level upon which efforts appear to be concentrated are preschool through primary although three of the laboratory programs involve junior or senior high school.

Current Titles in the **HIGHLIGHTS** Series:

Bold Action Programs for the Disadvantaged: Elementary Reading

Current Administrative Problems in Reading

Reading and Concept Attainment

Junior College Reading Programs

In-Service Programs in Reading

INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION
Six Tyre Avenue Newark, Delaware 19711

L4801 HL67-2